IPEA
EPO
D-80298 Munich
Germany

23 June 2005

Dear Sirs

PCT/GB2004/003945
Our ref: Caching Content (PCT)

Thank you for the Written Opinion of the ISA.

The Written Opinion cites the following against the independent claims:

  D1   WO 03/003688 (Sun)

The applicant files the following replacement pages:

  3 and 11- 13, to replace the same pages as originally filed.

Triplicate replacement pages are attached, together with one set of pages marked to show all changes.

Amended Claim 1 reads (with new text highlighted)

1.   A method of providing content to a mobile web browsing device from **any of several different** web servers, comprising the steps of:
(a)   receiving at a **remote** computer, connected to **both** the device **and each of those web servers** over a wireless network, a log of data identifying content that has been viewed by **that specific** device, **the log being generated and sent by the device;**

(b)   **the remote computer automatically identifying any of that viewed content that has been updated;**

2

(c) ████ ████ ████ automatically ████ ██ ████ ████████, updated content stored on ███ ██ the web servers to be sent to the device over the wireless network;

(d) causing that updated content to be automatically stored in device memory.

Support for the feature of the remote computer as something separate and distinct from the web server can be found at:

"The identity of content from a remote server (e.g. a WAP or web server) that is being viewed by the user on a mobile telephone is logged locally on the phone and that information replicated back (subject to user approval) to a remote computer (the 'Cognima Server') over a wireless network. With this information, and knowledge of how fast a given WAP/web site is changing, the Cognima Server can make intelligent decisions about whether it is worth pre-emptively caching particular content on a given user's phone – i.e. automatically sending updated versions of that content for automatic storage in device memory (typically cache memory)." Page 5 1st para.

Novelty and inventive step

The examiner has cited WO 03/003688 (Sun) **D1**. In **D1**, a web server communicates with client devices via a 'gateway portal'.

Newly amended Claim 1 differs for the following reasons:

1.   In the present invention, there is a 'remote computer' that receives a content log from the end-user device; this remote computer is separate from the various web servers and the end-user browsing devices and is connected to them all over a wireless network. **D1** describes in essence a conventional client server architecture, with the client browsing devices interacting solely with the web servers; no third entity equivalent to the remote computer is present. The 'gateway' certainly is not equivalent – it acts in essence as a protocol transformation engine:

> "In this three-tier architecture, the gateway is below the application layer and acts as a general purpose protocol transformation engine. Therefore, the gateway had very little to do with how server applications and client applications interact in a peer-to-peer fashion". Page 8 2nd para.

There is therefore nothing in **D1** equivalent to the 'remote computer' that is separate and connected over a wireless network to many different web servers, yet also monitors the browse activity of the end-user devices.

2.	In the present invention, there is a "log of data identifying content that has been viewed by a specific device; the log being generated and sent by the device". There is no equivalent log in **D1**. The browsing devices in **D1** do *not* report back the web pages that they have actually displayed to any external entity.

3.	In the present invention, we have a step of "identifying any of that viewed content that has been updated". There is no equivalent step in **D1**; **D1** does state that it adopts an "offline content accessing" model, where the "mobile devices acts as a cache or reservoir of information that may periodically synchronise with a server to update its cache." (page 6 2nd para). But **D1** is entirely silent on what in practice this means. For example, does it simply mean that, when a device connects with a server, it replaces all of the stored, cached content with the equivalent web pages that are on the server at that time? That would be one common way of performing a synchronisation, and would not require the step of "identifying any of that viewed content that has been updated".

If the objective technical problem is regarded as "how to identify content of interest to a user to be pushed to a device", then **D1** fails to disclose or suggest the claimed approach.

In the light of the amendments and arguments, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Langley